

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed January 25, 2007. Claims 10-12, 14-18 and 20-26 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. Claims 17, 18 and 20-24 are being amended, and claims 10-12 and 14-16 are being canceled, and new claims 27-29 are being added. Claims 17, 18 and 20-29 remain for the Examiner's consideration. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

I. Allowed Claims

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 25-26 are allowed. Claim 25 has been amended to clarify the antecedent basis for the “counter”, and to pluralize one use of the term “bit” to be “bits”.

II. Summary of Claim Rejections

Claims 10-12 were rejected 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,243,699 to Nickolls et al. (hereafter “Nickolls”).

Claims 14 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nickolls in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,812,881 to Ku et al. (hereafter “Ku”).

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nickolls and Ku in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,641,276 to Dunki-Jacobs (hereafter “Dunki-Jacobs”).

Claims 17, 18, 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nickolls in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,506,825 to Gushima al. (hereafter “Gushima”).

III. Discussion of the Claims

Applicants do not agree with the outstanding rejections of the claims. However, to expedite issuance of a patent, Applicants have focused on prosecuting claims specifically directed to laser drivers.

For example, claims 17, 18 and 20-24 have been amended to highlight how the double buffering features of the present invention are specifically used in laser drivers. Support for the claim amendments, as well as support for the new claims, are provided in the application as originally filed.

In the rejection of claim 17, it was admitted that Nickolls does not teach a laser driver. However, Gushima was relied upon for teaching this deficiency of Nickolls. It was also asserted that one having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to utilize the data transferring method/system of Nickolls to assist with the data transferring between the host and laser driver in order to improve the system reliability and throughput. Applicants respectfully disagree. Nickolls is directed to providing “a dynamic and flexible mapping between a massively parallel array of processors and the ordered data streams of convention I/O devices and files.” (see column 1, lines 33-55). In other words, Nickolls is for use in a system that includes multiple (e.g., thousands of) parallel processors that are to communicate with one or more I/O devices. Such an environment is quite different than typical a laser driver environment, where a laser driver is typically communicating with a single host. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to massive parallel processing art when trying to improve upon communications between laser driver and a host.

Additionally, while item 48 of Gushima is a laser driver, Gushima does not teach or suggest the details of the laser driver claimed in claim 17. Further, Gushima, alone or in combination with Nickolls, does not teach or suggest how the various elements of a laser driver will operate during reading and writing operations, as claimed in claim 17 and its dependent claims 18, 20-24 and 27-29.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 17, and its dependent claims, are now clearly patentable over the applied references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejections of these claims be reconsidered and withdrawn in view of the claim amendments and the above remarks.

It is also respectfully requested the new claims 27-29 be considered and allowed. Support for such new claims is provided in the application as originally filed.

IV. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully requested that all outstanding rejections and objections be reconsidered and withdrawn. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the required fees and any underpayment of fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 17, 2007

By: /Jeffrey R. Kurin/
Jeffrey R. Kurin
Reg. No. 41,132

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Facsimile: (415) 362-2928
Customer No. 23910